

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/581,301	ISNARDON ET AL.	
	Examiner BRIAN EPSTEIN	Art Unit 3628	
All Participants:		Status of Application: <u>Allowed</u>	
(1) <u>BRIAN EPSTEIN</u> .		(3) <u>Mr. Harry F. Smith</u> .	
(2) _____.		(4) _____.	
Date of Interview: <u>16 July 2010</u>		Time: <u>Afternoon</u>	
Type of Interview:			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (Copy given to: <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's representative)			
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			
If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.			
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed:			
<i>Independent claim 8.</i>			
Claims discussed:			
<i>Independent claim 8.</i>			
Prior art documents discussed:			
<i>All Relevant art. See Notice of References Cited</i>			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:			
<i>Please see below. Examiner has copied applicants representatives summary of interview below. Examiner agrees summary below is accurate and indicates the discussion completed during the examiner initiated interview..</i>			
Part III.			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.			
<i>/B. E./</i> Examiner, Art Unit 3628 July 17, 2010			
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)			

The Examiner initiated a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney on 07/15/2010 to discuss claims 1-21 as previously presented in the response to office action that was mailed on 02/24/2010. The Examiner indicated that allowable subject matter was present, but that there were several issues relating to 35 USC 101 and 35 USC 112, second paragraph, that needed to be resolved. More specifically, the Examiner indicated the presence of several issues related to claim clarity in method claim 8. In addition, the Examiner indicated that the claimed method could potentially be subject to a rejection under 35 USC 101. With respect to system claim 1 the Examiner expressed reservations concerning the overall clarity of the claim, as well as the overall construction of the claim due to, for example, the presence of the means plus function elements.

Agreement was reached to the extent that the Examiner would consider a supplemental amendment if filed by 07/16/2010. The undersigned suggested amending claim 8 to remove all potential issues noted by the Examiner, and then cancelling system claims 1-7 and re-writing them as system claims specifically reciting subject matter along the lines of a computer reservation system that comprised "at least one data processor connected with at least one memory that stores software executable by the at least one data processor, where execution of the software by the at least one data processor causes the computer reservation system to", and then including elements based on those in the amended claim 8. The Examiner agreed to consider an amendment to the claims along these lines. A first proposed amendment was emailed to the Examiner the morning of 07/16/2010.

In the follow-up telephone conversation held on 07/16/2010 the Examiner requested that the format of amended claim 8 be changed to remove some of the structure recited in the preamble and to more affirmatively recite certain structure in the body of the claim, as well as to indicate more affirmatively at the end of the claim the display of results. A similar request was made with respect to the end of claim 22.